REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 11, 13-23, 25-27 and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Corresponding revisions to those claims have been made. Claims 11, 13-23 25-27 and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,879,581 (Schlosser et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the following.

With respect to claim 11, in claim 11 both the primary station and the base station communicates with a plurality of stations. The claim has been amended to refer to a first plurality and a second plurality, respectively. Schlosser does not teach such an arrangement. Only the spacecraft in Schlosser communicates with a plurality of data terminals. The data terminals are shown and described communicating with the spacecraft. Whether the primary station or the base station is considered to be equivalent to the spacecraft of Schlosser, the other would not communicate with a plurality of stations. Accordingly, for that reason alone, claim 11 is distinguished from Schlosser.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Schlosser that the spacecraft communicates with a base station, which is a term well known in the art. The spacecraft in Schlosser clearly communicates with data terminals and not a base station as recited in the claim. Also, the spacecraft in Schlosser does not synchronize its transmit and receive timing to one of the data terminals as does the

primary station of the claims. The spacecraft in Schlosser does make some adjustments to its received timing, as is inherent with any synchronous receiver. Although Applicants' respectively submit that one skilled in art would not consider such time aligning for use in synchronous reception as synchronization of the received timing, Schlosser does not disclose that the spacecraft synchronizes its transmit timing with another station. The base station in Schlosser essentially dictates its transmit timing to the terminals and, accordingly, has no need to synchronize its transmit timing to those stations.

The spacecraft in Schlosser is also not transparent to the data terminals. Clearly, since both of the terminals synchronize to and communicate with the spacecraft of Schlosser, clearly this spacecraft can not be transparent to both of the users. There is no disclosure in Schlosser that the terminals could synchronize one subscriber to the other subscriber without the aid of the spacecraft and, accordingly, there is no way that the spacecraft could be deemed as being transparent to those stations. For analogous reasons independent claims 15 and 19 are also allowable. Since the other claims depend on one of the independent claims, they are also allowable and further include elements further distinguishing them from the prior art.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaewell, Jr. et al.

By _____
Jeffrey M. Glabicki
Registration No. 42,584
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

JMG/dmr